

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 19-11, 12, 22-23, 25, 28-29, 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Carre (U.S. Patent 6,282,579). Applicants assert that this rejection is not supported by the teaching of the cited art for at least the following reasons.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Carre does not teach receiving a plurality of communications each pertaining to a different one of a plurality of managed objects from a management server for the managed objects, wherein each communication comprises data typed according to an abstract syntax notation, and accessing a converter interface for each communication for converting the abstract syntax notation data types of each communication to interface definition language data types, wherein the same converter interface is accessed for each of the managed objects such that the converting is generic to the managed objects. In the prior art, as discussed in Applicants' Description of the Relevant Art section at p. 7 lines 14-27, to provide for CORBA communications a specific IDL interface is defined and compiled for each managed object. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Carre appears to be an example of the type of prior art as described in Applicants' Description of the Relevant Art section that provides a specific IDL interface defined and compiled for each managed object.

On p. 8 of the Final Action, the Examiner refers to col. 5, lines 9-20 of Carre as teaching that the agent A consists of one or more OSI objects OA (see Fig. 2a). The Examiner then refers to col. 5, lines 30-39 of Carre as teaching that the OA objects are converted from ASN.1 to IDL. From this, the Examiner draws the conclusion that Carre's converter "must be generic enough to handle the plurality of OA and OM

objects.” This conclusion is unfounded in Carre’s teachings. Although Carre does teach that “component A consists of one or more OSI objects OA” (col. 5, lines 12-13), Carre also teaches that its converter “GDMO/C++ consists of one or more specific access objects” (col. 5, lines 21-22). This teaching in Carre implies that Carre’s converter includes a specific access object for each OSI object (like the prior art described in Applicants’ Description of the Relevant Art section). Therefore, Carre’s converter is not taught to be generic to the different managed objects. Applicants also note that col. 5, lines 30-31 of Carre refers to a specified interface for the object OA (singular). Nothing in Carre teaches, or even suggests, that Carre’s converter is generic to a plurality of different managed objects. Thus, the Examiner’s statement that Carre’s converter must be generic amounts to nothing more than speculation by the Examiner which can only have been based in hindsight. Since the rejection is not supported by the teachings of the cited art, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants further assert that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims is further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejection of the independent claims has been shown to be improper, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

Section 103(a) Rejections:

The Office Action rejected claims 2-6, 12, 14-18, 24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carre in view of AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art). Claims 7-9, 19-21, 32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carre. Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carre in view of Goldberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,496,833). Applicants assert that these rejections are all flawed for similar reasons as stated above in regard to Carre. Applicants further assert that the rejections of numerous ones of the dependent claims are further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejection of the independent claims has been shown to be improper, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION


Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-46100/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Fee Authorization Form authorizing a deposit account debit in the amount of \$
for fees ().
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,


Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: March 18, 2004